Vol. 5, No. 3 Fifth Month (May) 1914

Bulletin of Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia

CONTENTS

PAGE

David Lloyd, Part II (conclusion).....Isaac Sharpless, 74

Address of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting to George I, 1725, 87

A Church Quarrel and What Resulted.....Julia S. White, 90

Declaration of Fidelity to William III. 98

Certificate for John Grubb, 1731..... 100

Annual Meeting of Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia, 1914.....Mary S. Allen 102

Officers of Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia, 1914, 104

Books of Interest to Friends.....The Editor 105

Notes and Queries..... 109

NOTE.—The editor does not hold himself responsible for any statement made in contributed articles.

All communications for the BULLETIN should be addressed to Allen C. Thomas, Haverford, Pa.

All dues and subscriptions should be paid to Mary S. Allen, Secretary-Treasurer, 24 West Street, Media, Pa.

Subscriptions, $1.00 per annum. All members receive the BULLETIN, free.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/quaker-history_1914-05_5_3

DAVID LLOYD.

(Concluded)

By Isaac Sharpless.

Nor did matters change greatly when Penn in 1709 sent over Charles Gookin to supersede Evans. The personal faults of Evans were not reproduced in Gookin, but he was obstinate and head-strong, and perhaps, as he himself intimated, a little unbalanced mentally.

There were, however, two underlying causes for the trouble. One was that Penn was now in desperate financial straits, and could not yield his perquisites except at the cost of absolute ruin. His part of the expenses of government had to be borne, the quit-rents were coming in slowly, and his steward, Ford, had cheated him out of his fortune. The income from fines, licenses and other governmental functions were his by the arrangement previously made, and he could not afford to yield them.

The other was that while Deputy Governors changed, Logan remained. He could not always control the unwise acts of the Deputies, but he could largely influence general policy and was absolutely faithful to the Penn interests. The matters for which Lloyd contended were in the interests of the larger democracy and prosperity of the colony, but Penn could not afford to give up his undoubted rights, and Logan would not yield one iota to popular clamor. Lloyd was right in looking upon Logan as his great antagonist. Both were determined and fearless, and personal feeling was added to political diversity of interests.

One of the subjects about which the controversy raged was the composition of the courts of Justice. The charter of Charles II to William Penn gave him the right to establish courts and appoint their officers. He finally allowed the Assembly to draw up bills for such establishment, but retained the appointment of judges and clerks. As Penn's interests were larger than those of any other individual, Lloyd's claim was that these officers should be independent of any obligations to him. There appear

to have been no serious complaints as to the character of these officials, or that substantial justice was not done.

Again, in a community of Friends, it was of vital consequence that a juror or witness should be accepted on his affirmation, for he would not swear. It would be impossible to secure competent administration of justice without Friends, for in all the country communities they constituted nearly all the responsible people. There is no doubt that Penn appreciated this, but the charge of Lloyd was that he did not succeed in having laws ratified in England making provision for the full acceptance of the affirmation as equivalent to the oath.

Then there was the burning question of the licensing of public houses. Lloyd and the Assembly claimed that this was one of the proper functions of the courts and that the licensees should be appointed by local authority rather than by the Proprietary, so as to secure the choice of proper persons, who would restrain drunkenness and attendant crimes.

All these and other matters were to be fought through between the Governor and Logan on one side and Lloyd and the Assembly on the other.

In the fall of 1706 Lloyd had a bill passed through the Assembly for a Supreme Court with three judges to which appeals could be made, also local courts for the counties for ordinary crimes, having also the power to grant licenses for taverns—providing that all fines should go towards the payment of the judges, who should be removable by the Assembly and therefore out of reach of proprietary influence; that the judges should appoint the clerks, and that freeholders should not be imprisoned for debt.

This, of course, would be a great step in advance towards popular control of the course of justice. The Governor objected to it *in toto*. There was no need for more than one Justice of the Supreme Court—fines and fees belonged to the Proprietary, and judges and clerks should not be independent of him. It was a Proprietary prerogative which the Assembly had no authority to question, granted by the charter and due to him in return for his large concessions and care of the province.

The Governor threatened to establish courts on his own authority, as the royal charter empowered him to do in certain cases, but the Assembly told him that any one who should advise this would be considered an enemy of the country.

A conference was arranged between the Council and Assembly and a point of etiquette now threatened a complete stop to legislation. After the matter had been debated courteously for a time Lloyd neglected to rise when he spoke. The Governor commanded him to do so. To Lloyd this command was sufficient to arouse his pugnacity and he refused to obey, saying that he represented the people and in an open conference no special deference to the Governor was necessary. This broke up the conference. The Assembly sent a semi-apologetic message to the Governor, and Lloyd himself wrote a defence which could hardly be called an apology, ending with these words, characteristic of the man: "I do solemnly declare that my refusal to comply with the Governor's humour (for so I conceive it to be when he exerts his command when he should not) was not with a design to affront him but to show my dissent to that which I thought had a tendency to frustrate the freedom of conferences; not knowing, if I complied with this, whether the next command would not more highly affect the rights and privileges of this house which I am conscientiously concerned to maintain everywhere, and if in this I have done any thing unbecoming the station you have put me in I shall freely submit to your censure."

The Governor tried to secure a more personal apology, but he never received it, and the incident added to the bitterness of the times.

Ultimately compromises were reached embracing the most for which Lloyd had striven. The Proprietary retained the right to appoint clerks of the courts and holders of licenses, but these could be nominated by provincial bodies. Judges independent of the Penn interests were not appointed by the crown according to Lloyd's plan, but men of highest character were chosen, and Lloyd himself did not disdain to accept the office of Chief Justice from his patrons' hands.

But Lloyd and Logan in the forefront of the controversy

recognized, each the other, as the chief obstacle to his plans. Penn sent over pressing advice to impeach Lloyd, for accepting office illegally under Thomas Lloyd and for his irregular actions in the case of the Remonstrance of 1704. Logan said that there were no substantial grounds on which to build an impeachment and was too wise to attempt it. But Lloyd with the full Assembly back of him entered joyously upon an impeachment of Logan. The real reason was that Logan had the brains and courage of the administration and Lloyd was right in considering him the chief obstacle in the way. Much time and much legal fencing were employed, but the matter came to an end when the Council decided that it had no authority to try impeachments and the Secretary was saved. He shortly after went to England on a visit and returned stronger than ever.

Governor Gookin next tried a tilt with Lloyd in the matter of an appropriation for a military expedition against the French in Canada. In a rather facetious letter he himself tells the results: "The Queen having honored me with her commands that this Province should furnish out 150 men for its expedition against Canada, I called an Assembly and demanded £4,000; they being all Quakers, after much delay resolved, N. C., that it was contrary to their religious principles to hire men to kill one another. I told some of them the Queen did not hire men to kill one another, but to destroy her enemies. One of them answered the Assembly understood English. After I had tried all ways to bring them to reason they again resolved, N. C., that they could not directly or indirectly raise money for an expedition to Canada, but they had voted the Queen £500 as a token of their respect, etc., and that the money should be put into a safe hand till they were satisfied from England it should not be employed for the use of war. I told them the Queen did not want such a sum, but being a pious and good woman perhaps she might give it to the clergy sent hither for the propagation of the Gospel; one of them answered that was worse than the other, on which arose a debate in the Assembly whether they should give money or not, since it might be employed for the use of war, or against their future establishment, and after much wise debate

it was carried in the affirmative by one voice only. Their number is 26.[1] They are entirely governed by their speaker, one David Lloyd."

But the people finally got tired of the bickerings of parties. Lloyd in his contest with Evans and Logan had again overstepped the mark. In the fall of 1710 the election showed a completely new Assembly. Neither Lloyd nor any of his followers was returned. Instead there came in William Trent, Jonathan Dickinson, Caleb Pusey, Richard Hill, Isaac Norris and other of the best friends of William Penn. There was what would be called in modern politics "a tidal wave" which showed that, except for serious errors by Deputies, the heart of the people was true to the Founder. Impeachments were dropped, £2,000 was voted "for the Queen's use," abundance of useful legislation, held back by the partisanship of previous years was created, and the youthful province having passed over the perilous times of infancy, started fairly on its successful career.

Lloyd was temporarily laid aside, and yet his great services in founding the real democracy of Pennsylvania under the generous provisions of the Founder had largely been accomplished. Whether he felt this or whether about this time he experienced a real change of heart, as suggested by some biographers, may never be known, but certain it is that the peaceful and also effective part of his life and public employment was yet to follow in a score of years of honored and honorable service.

He did not remain long out of public office. About 1711 he moved his residence from Philadelphia to Chester; in the same year he was elected to the Assembly from Chester County, but did not receive the Speakership. This also happened in 1712 and 1713. In 1714, however, he was unanimously chosen Speaker, for which service, in a general way, no one could compete with him in capability. The records of the time indicate the great prosperity of the Province growing in wealth and population at a rapid rate, and the absence of the unhappy divisions of earlier years. A further indication of the softening of the partisan

[1] Eight from each county and two from Philadelphia.

asperities of the first decade of the century was the appointment of David Lloyd as Chief Justice in 1718 to succeed his father-in-law, Joseph Growdon, who had held the position for ten years preceding and who had frequently opposed him in the House.

In May, 1717, Sir William Keith succeeded Governor Gookin. He was selected by Hannah Penn, for while her husband was still alive, he had so far failed in body and mind as to be incapable of business and about a year later died.

Keith was a wise and politic Governor. He had the confidence of Logan and Norris and he now undertook to secure the support of Lloyd and the Assembly and the good will of the people. He rightly judged that the Quakers must be kept friendly to him if he would be preserved from endless disputes. He found them troubled with their difficulties as to oaths, and in a diplomatic way suggested that they should adopt the English penal code and in exchange receive the right to affirm instead of swearing. The same bill which made an affirmation legal for those whose consciences would not allow them to swear, extended capital punishment to burglary, rape, counterfeiting and other serious crimes. The mild penal code of Penn wherein murder only was made a capital offense and which was applied to one case only prior to 1700, died with him. There seems to have been no testimony against capital punishment among Friends. David Lloyd, a member in good standing, drew up the bill, it was passed by a Quaker Assembly, approved by a Quaker Council and endorsed by a Quaker community. Had they felt as most modern Friends do, it may be considered as doubtful whether the right to affirm would have been deemed a sufficient compensation for a severe code involving capital punishment. We can easily appreciate how much the affirmation meant to them. For without it they would have been deprived of all share in government and anarchy would have resulted. But we can hardly appreciate that a testimony against capital punishment did not mean as much.

Governor Keith's entire attitude was gracious and conciliatory. He had learned from the experience of former Governors how hard a task it was to contest a popular Assembly led by

David Lloyd and he went over completely to the other side, yet at first not so imprudently as to draw fire from Logan and his friends. He made Lloyd his Chief Justice and assumed the role of protector of popular liberties, thus procuring for himself immediate popular support. He had his reward in prompt votes for salary and easy times.

Material prosperity accompanied political peace. There was only one drawback, the lack of ready money. Coin was drained to Europe to make the purchases needed by a growing community which imported far more than it exported. Barter was common, but was inconvenient. Keith shrewdly suggested a paper currency. Norris and Logan objected and their fears were echoed from England. There seemed to be abundant ground for hesitation. Many of the Colonies had tried it and with disastrous results. As a little stimulated trade, more, they argued, would be better; and they increased the amount until it lost its purchasing power and depreciated. But Lloyd and his friends urged it and Keith had his way.

This balance of forces was just what was needed to make it a success. It was issued sparingly on the security of land and plate. It stimulated trade and never depreciated. Pennsylvania taught the lesson, and all through her colonial history she had an abundant stable paper currency, due largely to the initiative of Keith and Lloyd and the caution of Logan. But the latter element did not win the popular appreciation as did the former, and Keith became immensely popular. The Assembly sent him a congratulatory letter and a vote of supplies. The Council, which had been largely ignored by the Governor, as indeed by the charter of 1701 he had a right to ignore it, as having no necessary function in legislation, drew away from him, and in 1722 Keith, feeling himself strong enough to dispense with it, removed Logan from his offices as Councillor and Secretary, thus forcing him out of the government entirely.

But Logan was still strong with Hannah Penn, and sailing to England he soon returned with definite instructions to Keith, threatening him with removal. Keith was constitutionally right, but he was the servant of the heirs of William Penn, and they

trusted Logan. He concluded to stand by his plans, and to set against proprietary powers, popular support. Logan attacked him in a long memorial, and David, with some of the spirit and vigor of a score of years earlier, entered the lists against his old adversary. His abundant citation of authorities and able legal arguments were conclusive, if such matters could settle the question. He was again Speaker of the Assembly as well as Chief Justice, and that body under his guidance sent to Hannah Penn a remonstrance against the contemplated removal of the Governor and a eulogy of his services to the State.

From the Lloyd point of view the administration of Keith was the consummation of the efforts for which he had been struggling for many years. The Assembly, as the representatives of the people, had been exalted and their rights defined and extended. The Courts had been created by the act of Assembly, made reasonably responsive to popular demands and the great democratic leader placed at the head of the system. The Quakers had received that for which Lloyd had always pleaded—the right to a full participation in government without being sworn. English wars had ceased to disturb the peaceable principles of the ruling sect, and to crown all a stable material prosperity, satisfying alike to proprietaries and people, had settled down upon the Province. It is not to be wondered at that Lloyd in his old age awakened from his quietude to defend the cause with which he had been so long and so intimately associated in his earlier years.

With such a record and such support Keith thought he could defy England. He felt that the heirs would hardly dare to remove him, and if they did he imagined he might even overthrow the proprietary government itself and make a crown colony, with himself as Governor.

But with all that he had learned he under-estimated the strength of the sentiment of the people of Pennsylvania to the Founder's family, and when the day of his removal came he had nothing to do but hand over his office to old Patrick Gordon, who, in 1726, had been sent over to supersede him.

Lloyd also accepted the failure of his plans gracefully. Indeed, he and the Assembly may almost be accused of apostasy

by allowing their enthusiasm for Keith to pass away. When the ex-Governor had himself elected to the next Assembly and became a candidate for Speaker, Lloyd turned against him and easily defeated him. His further career was neither happy nor dignified, and the unwisdom of his closing years was allowed to cloud his great services to the cause of free government.

This was the last important public controversy of David Lloyd. In honored performance of his duties as Chief Justice he lived until 1731. He died aged 75 years.

After this sketch of David Lloyd's life it is unnecessary to say much as to his character. He was a great lawyer, probably the greatest of Colonial Pennsylvania. In this capacity he was always efficient and faithful to his clients, sometimes possibly at the expense of pure morality. In most legal circles this would hardly seem a fault, but the Quakers of the time from their lay standpoint could not always justify him.

As a politician he was equally competent. He led by sheer ability and persistence. Logan tells us—and this was at the time before their personal differences had developed: "He is a man very stiff in all his undertakings, of a sound judgment and a good lawyer, but extremely pertinacious and somewhat revengeful." Proud says cautiously: "His political talents seem rather to divide than to unite; a policy that may suit the crafty politician but must ever be disclaimed by the Christian Statesman."

It is unfair to assume that Logan's further estimates of his character, given in the heat of their partisan controversy, are conclusive. He tells, however, how it was that Lloyd maintained his great influence in the Assembly, and we may at least guess the truth from his statements. "The generality (of the Assemblymen) are honestly and well inclined and out of the Assembly are very good men, but when got together I know not how they are infatuated and led by smooth stories," and again he speaks of the great influence "he has over the majority composed of designing and weak men;" and again, "He carries so fair with our weak country people and those that have long looked upon him to be the champion of the Friends' cause in government matters in former times that there is no possessing

them." And again, "Jones and Wilcox stand by him in mischievous intentions. The rest think they are faithfully discharging their duty to the country."

Lloyd was the great leader of the country members, and these were a large majority of the Assembly. They were worthy, honest men, but Lloyd was so vastly their superior in learning, ability and political skill that he practically voted them as he would. Whenever the Logan party got control a much abler and more responsible body of men appeared in the Assembly, only to be thrown aside when Lloyd returned to power.

David Lloyd became for the times wealthy, but no suspicion of mercenary methods appears in his politics. He probably made his money by his legal practice and still more by advances on real estate. His salary as Chief Justice was generally £150 a year, and the Assembly paid him for his labors in framing legislation and writing addresses, but his public work would not explain more than a poor living.

As a Friend we do not find him prominently mentioned in the minutes of the meetings—at least in comparison with the records of Samuel Carpenter, Isaac Norris and many another. Perhaps there was, as the minutes of Philadelphia Monthly Meeting in the case of the dispute with Pastorius shows, a lurking suspicion that his methods could not be fully justified.

It is a significant fact, however, that Chester Monthly Meeting was the most persistent of any in urging upon the Yearly Meeting the iniquity of the slave trade and the necessity to take strong action.[2] The first one of these epistles was in 1711, which was the year Lloyd moved from Philadelphia to Chester, and the last was in 1730, the year before he died, and their style suggests the bold, vigorous, uncompromising spirit that penned the Assembly addresses of the same period. This is not conclusive, but it seems highly probable that the attitude of the early Friends of Pennsylvania towards questions of slavery was largely due to the clear thinking and fearless writing of David Lloyd.

---

[2] See Whittier's Introduction to "John Woolman's Journal."

David Lloyd's second wife was Grace Growdon, the daughter of Joseph Growdon, of Bucks County, one of the leading men of the colony and in the main an adherent of the Penn-Logan party. Why the father cut off Grace with five shillings in his will is probably not known, but he frequently opposed his son-in-law in politics. They were married in 1697. Their only son died when four years old, as the result, it is stated, of fright because he was placed in a dark closet for punishment during the absence of his parents. David Lloyd had no descendants to care for his reputation, and except in the public records, he left but little about himself.

He had landed interests in Chester and represented Chester County in the Assembly until 1700. Then he transferred his residence to Philadelphia, and that county made him its representative for the coming decade. Afterwards he moved to Chester for his declining years.

Grace Lloyd was a minister in the Society of Friends and was much loved and trusted. There is an account in the life of Jane Hoskins[3] which gives a little insight into the family and religious life of David and Grace Lloyd.

Jane Fenn (afterwards Hoskins) come over to Pennsylvania in 1712, in response to a call of duty. She was of poor circumstances, and engaged herself as a servant in Friends' families, at the same time diligently attending religious meetings. She tells her own story: "One First-day after I had sat some time in Haverford Meeting, David Lloyd from Chester, with his wife and several other Friends came into meeting. As soon as they were seated, it was as though it had been spoken to me, 'These are the people with whom thou must go and settle.' They being strangers to me, and appearing as persons of distinction, I said, Lord, how can such an one as I get acquainted with people who appear so much above the common rank. The word was in my soul, 'Be still, I will make way for thee in their hearts—they shall seek to thee.' I knew not what to think of this, and was afraid it might be a temptation of Satan; yet was contented in

[3] Friends' Library, Vol. I, p. 460, etc.

the thought, that the Lord who never yet failed, was all-sufficient to provide for me. At that instant a great stillness came over me, and I felt the love of my heavenly Father to affect me in a very uncommon manner. I afterwards understood that David Lloyd and his wife fixed their eyes upon me, felt a near sympathy with me, such as they had never known towards a stranger before, and said in their hearts, this young woman is or will be a preacher. They were both tendered, and it was fixed in their minds, that they were to take me under their care, and nurse me for the Lord's service, with a promise that his blessing should attend them. This I had from their own mouths after I lived with them."

Jane Fenn became "an upper servant" in the family of David Lloyd. This came in response to a suggestion of an English Friend who had become interested in her religious life. "After dinner," she says, "the Friend spoke to David Lloyd and his wife. 'Take this young woman, make her your adopted child and give her liberty to go wherever Truth leads.' . . . Grace Lloyd then took me into another apartment and told me how she and her husband were drawn in love to me the first time they saw me at Haverford."

Jane Fenn became a minister and made extensive travels through other colonies to Barbadoes and later to Ireland and England in religious service. She returned from a foreign trip in 1730 "and was affectionately received by my kind friends and benefactors, David and Grace Lloyd."

"Soon after my arrival David Lloyd was taken ill with his last sickness, during which I thought it my duty to attend on him as usual. On the 6th of the second month, 1731, he departed this life; and in him I lost a father, and a sure friend. In all the journeys I went, whilst he lived, he cheerfully supplied me with the necessaries requisite. He was exemplary in his family, treating all about him with humanity, choosing rather to be loved than feared. He was diligent in attending meetings for worship, and those of his servants who inclined to go to meetings, he allowed to perform that necessary duty. After my arrival I did not live as an hired servant with David Lloyd, or with his widow,

though I remained with her, at her request, till I married, which was in the year 1738."

The value of David Lloyd's services to the State will lie, (1) in his successful insistence upon an independent legislature. He had evidently a large though undetermined share in procuring from Penn the charter of 1701, which cut the Council out of all legislative powers. He was ever keen to notice any small attempts to reinstate it in such powers in indirect ways. He had the modern faith in the people and was jealous of any tendency which would circumscribe the privilege of the elective Assembly. (2) He, more than any other man, fought out the Quaker battle for the affirmation instead of the oath, and for the further contest for a form of affirmation which was simply a promise, without bringing in the name of God, which in some minds made it a modified oath; and (3) while Penn arranged for an executive and a legislature, he omitted to make provision for a judiciary, probably intending to create this by his own authority under his charter from the King. The form which the machinery of the courts finally assumed and its large independence of proprietary influence, was the great work of David Lloyd.

In the words of Proud, it is true that Lloyd's efforts "tended rather to divide than to unite." He could not work comfortably with opponents and bring them to his own point of view. By his staunch Quakerism and superior knowledge he brought his followers into loyal allegiance, but he was uncompromising in his attitude towards opposition. Whether the beneficent results of his career could have been achieved by a gentler spirit, less tenacious of every little point, arousing less personal antagonism, more gracious and diplomatic in argument, may be difficult to determine with certainty. It is not unreasonable so to think.

But it is difficult to estimate the full value of his services. His strong personality, his persistent energy, his extreme perception of the value of liberty and determination to defend it against any, even small, encroachments, made him a strong factor, perhaps after William Penn the strongest factor in building up the colonial Commonwealth on the basis of popular rights. Had he known how the letters to Penn of his great rival would

have formed the basis of history, he might have left stronger defences of his work and positions. There is not much evidence, however, that he considered the judgment of the future as of consequence. He was too busy attaining immediate objects. It is only in quite recent times that his name and reputation have emerged from the mass of statements against him contained in the voluminous letters of political opponents and their descendants. Without family, with a following, numerous and devoted but not literary, with an independence which kept him in somewhat doubtful relations to many of the prominent Friends of the Yearly Meeting, without adequate biography, he has hardly received the attention which his undoubtedly great public services demand.

His countrymen appreciated him. The Rev. Abel Morgan wrote a Welsh Concordance to the Bible, which was published in 1730 and dedicated to Chief Justice Lloyd as a token of esteem and an appreciation of his devotion to the principles of liberty. He aided in the revision of the translation of a religious treatise called "A Salutation to the Britains." During his later years he published two small treatises: "A Vindication of the Legislative Powers" and "A Defense of the Legislative Constitution of the Province of Pennsylvania."

These were the occupation of his declining years of peaceful repose in contrast with the stirring scenes of his earlier life. They indicate, however, that the trend of his thought never changed.

AN ADDRESS OF PHILADELPHIA YEARLY MEETING TO KING GEORGE I, 1725.[1]

[The following interesting address to George I has been furnished the BULLETIN by M. Ethel Crawshaw of London. It has been copied from the original in the London Record Office.

[1] NOTE.—Record Office, London, C.o.5. 1233, No. 172. [Endorsed] "Address by the Quakers at Philadelphia." 18½ inches by 16½ inches. From the word "Signed" to the end in John Estaugh's hand.

The occasion referred to in the paper was the passage in 1724 of the act allowing affirmations in legal matters. Under William Penn's legislation affirmations were provided for and were of equal value with oaths. In 1714 or 1715 the English act regulating legal oaths was extended to the colonies for five years. Governor Gookin claimed that this repealed the Quaker legislation regarding affirmations, and in spite of urgent remonstrances and protests held to his opinion. When Penn's charter was granted the scruples of the Quakers were perfectly well known and the charge that Gookin's action was one of bad faith seems just. As nearly all magistracies, judgeships, etc., were held by Quakers, the administration of justice came to a standstill. This condition lasted for about two years, and it is greatly to the credit of the community that comparatively little disorder or crime resulted. The story is too long a one to follow. Suffice it to say that in 1724 an act was passed by the Pennsylvania Assembly which was accepted by the crown. A form of affirmation was agreed upon satisfactory to the Quakers, but any one was permitted to take an oath if he so preferred. The result, however, was to drive the Quakers from all offices which involved administering oaths, for individuals who might have no objection to administering a legal oath to another, who had no scruples, were disciplined by their meetings. To gain this compromise the Pennsylvania Quakers agreed to adopt the English criminal code, thus adding many crimes to the list of capital offenses. William Penn's humane code was practically abolished, and was not restored until the time of American Revolution.[2]

It is to the acceptance of this compromise act that the somewhat fulsome words of the address refer.

As George I could neither speak nor read English it is not likely he ever saw the address, and probably would have cared little for it if he had. As a matter of fact, it is well known he cared nothing for his British subjects.—EDITOR.]

---

[2] See article "David Lloyd" in present issue, p. 79.

ADDRESS.

To Our Gracious Sovereign George King of Great Brittain &c.

The Humble address of His Protestant Subjects called Quakers from Their Yearly Meeting held at Philadelphia in the Province of Pensilvania the twenty first day of the Seventh Month [Sept.] one thousand Seven hundred and twenty five, 1725.

In an Humble Sence of the many blessings and Mercys which flow from the Divine Being to Mankind, We cannot but see and acknowledge them to be in a peculiar manner dispensed to the Nations and People over Whom He hath been pleasd to establish so gracious a Prince, Great in his goodness and Love to his People, Great in the benignity of his Reign which reaches to the most distant of his Subjects, And Great in the Sight of the Nations round about.

If any of the present Age should yet through Wantonness or wickedness shut their eyes and not See or be thank full for such happiness, Ages to come will look back upon it with Admiration And Kings may set before them the Example; Posterity will mark it in their Annals and if ever Attempts should again be made upon true Liberty and the Laws, Princes may find the mistake and dishonour of such endeavours in former times and remark Thy Reign as the way to true grandure.

We have great cause among the rest of Our ffellow-Subjects to express Our affection and Duty to Our Soveraign and to be as we truly are particularly thankfull for the Royal assent to An Act of this Province Entitul'd An Act prescribing the forms of declaration of fidelity Abjuration and Affirmation instead of the forms heretofore required in such cases.

This benevolence of Our King in A matter which so nearly touches the Conscience makes deep Impression on our Hearts beyond words. But to the Almighty who sees them do we earnestly pray for the long continuance of His Reign. That an increase of blessings may be showered down on his Person and Throne and that his Posterity may be late and long established therein.

Signed In Behalfe and by apoyntment of the said Meetting.

JOHN ESTAUGH.

A CHURCH QUARREL AND WHAT RESULTED.

By Julia S. White.

"Rachel Wright a friend of the Minestry and wife of John Wright one of the first beginers of a Meeting at Bush River Departed this life the 23rd Day of the 12 mo. one Thousand Seven Hundred and Seventy one 1771 aged about 52 years." It is thus that the records of the Friends' meeting at Bush River, South Carolina, chronicle the death of one, who, despite her being "a friend of the Minestry," had given the church considerable trouble, trouble so far-reaching that this good woman would have stood aghast at the consequent results. For it was about Rachel Wright that one of the greatest church quarrels of North Carolina Yearly Meeting centered. In the quarrel there came first the disownment of Herman Husband from membership with Friends, a fact which left him free to become the leader in the Regulation movement, culminating in the Battle of Alamance, and that without doing violence to the peace principles of the church.

The second notable result of this church quarrel was the settlement of Friends in the State of Georgia at Wrightsboro. One of the factions led by Joseph Maddock and Jonathan Sell swarmed off and made this settlement; and knowing their sympathies in the Rachel Wright affair, one is not surprised to find the name of the meeting such as it is, *i. e.*, Wrightsboro.

It is for defending the Friends of North Carolina in a careful adherence to their peace principles which is the object of this paper and not to defend or to condemn our "Friend of the Minestry," Rachel Wright.

As is well known, the storm center of the Regulation movement was in what is now Alamance and adjoining counties. The Friends' meeting of that section at that time was Cane Creek, a meeting still vigorous and the oldest Friends' meeting in the Piedmont district of North Carolina. This meeting was established in 1751 and has maintained itself ever since. The original members of this meeting were a part of that great wave of colonization coming largely from Pennsylvania, and pouring

southward through Maryland and the valley of Virginia into Piedmont, Carolina, and then on across the line into South Carolina and yet on into the hill country of Georgia. These people were largely Scotch-Irish and brought to Carolina an influx of sturdiness and of thrift which soon gained recognition from, and ere long precedence over, the eastern section of the State which at that time (1751) had been settled about one hundred years.

In the second year of the existence of the Cane Creek meeting Rachel Wright asks for a "certificate to travel in the service of Truth in Lower Virginia." In 1753 she makes a visit to Friends of the Cape Fear (N. C.) section. In 1758 she visits families and thus she seems quite active as "a friend of the Ministry." However, in 1762 she "hath been guilty of some disorders" (its nature is not recorded). She offers a paper of condemnation and the same is accepted. By the next year she has moved to South Carolina, and when her certificate is asked for the trouble begins; for some Friends think "there was lack of sincerity" in the paper of condemnation which was offered the meeting and the certificate is withheld. Rachel Wright appeals to the Quarterly Meeting (Western), and this meeting, after careful investigation, decides Cane Creek Monthly Meeting "to be rather too exact or strenuous." The committee appointed by the Quarterly Meeting reversed the decision of the Monthly Meeting and issued the certificate. This, of course, left Cane Creek Monthly Meeting in a turmoil. Twelve Friends of the Quarterly Meeting are appointed to try to settle matters at Cane Creek, but in 11th month, 1763, they report as follows:

"There still appears a great disorder in the said Monthly Meeting of Cane Creek occasioned by a party not only contending with and opposing the proceedings of the Quarterly Meeting but also making a division and separation in the said Monthly Meeting by endeavoring to uphold, maintain and defend practices contrary to the wholesome rules of discipline established in the wisdom of Truth amongst us. And the chief actors in this party appears to be Herman Husbands, Joseph Maddock, Isaac Vernon, Thomas Branson, John and Wm. Marshill, Jonathan

Cell [Sell] with divers others that appears in a more private way to join them whose present situation and manner of proceedings appears to this meeting to be of very dangerous and destructive consequence, etc."

Be it said that the above named Friends were suspended from "the privilege of active members or to be made use of in any of our meetings."

Joseph Maddock, Jonathan Sell [Cell], John and Wm. Marshill make an appeal to the Yearly Meeting. The Yearly Meeting condemns the action of the Quarterly Meeting in "granting Rachel Wright a certificate if the same were carried into a precedent;" and it also reversed the minute of the Quarterly Meeting disabling "the said appellants from being active members." This matter tosses back and forth with the Monthly Meeting doing one thing, the Quarterly Meeting reversing it and the Yearly Meeting overruling that. However, Rachel Wright and her children get a certificate in 3d month, 1767.

In the meanwhile it will be noted that while Herman Husband's name headed the list of those who at first opposed the certificate, his name does not appear in the later deliberations; for, previous to the Yearly Meeting in 10th month, 1764, the following appears in the Cane Creek records for 1st month, 1764: "Herman Husband being complained of for being guilty of making remarks on the actions and transactions of this meeting as well as elsewhere as his mind, and publicly advertising the same, and after due labor with him in order to show him the evil of so doing this meeting agrees to disown him as also to publish the testimony."

This seems a long preliminary to show *how* Herman Husband lost his membership among Friends, as well as *when*, and that it came about in a pure church quarrel with nothing save a war of words as its cause; also that the *date* of the same was much prior (four years) to the real work of the Regulation. Hence, while Husband had been a Friend, his leadership in the Regulation was not the cause of his severance from the Society, neither did he directly bring reproach upon the Society in its attitude toward war, by his keen participation in the revolt against

undue taxation. And yet it cannot be said that Friends have not lost much from the fact that Herman Husband ever was a Quaker; for any popular work in Carolina to-day in regard to him seems thoroughly at ease upon the fact that he was a Quaker. Some even call him a "Quaker preacher." (See Fitch, Some Neglected Bits of North Carolina History.) But I can find no hint of the same in the church records. That he was a born leader every one acknowledges and that he was such in the church is also evident.

Haywood, in his book on Governor Tryon, satirizes Husband's desertion at the Battle of Alamance in the following words: "The odor thereof (*i. e.*, Battle) reminded him of what up to that time he seems to have forgotten, that he was a Quaker with conscientious scruples against carnal warfare. So leaving his less pious followers to try conclusions with the hated Tryon he scampered away to Pennsylvania there to breed fresh discord, etc."

A much more candid statement and one coming from nearer the time of Husband is found in Caruther's Life of David Caldwell, and is as follows: "There is no class of people in the country who are better acquainted with all business transactions of ordinary life or who have a more correct understanding of their rights and privileges as citizens; but the Quakers, if they were not foremost in the Regulation, appear to have united heartily in all the measures for the correction of abuses, except *fighting*, and it is said that *some* of them had metal enough to try their hand at that too. . . . It is doubtful whether even Herman Husband really wished to fight. Indeed I have been told by some *who knew him well* in their youth and who were at that time eighteen or twenty years of age that his Quaker principles would not let him fight and that when he saw the tug of war would come he mounted his horse and rode away."

That Husband was an agitator is easily concluded, and that he could be exasperating is proved in the case of the taxes from his constituency which he contemptuously proffered the Governor with the statement that the taxes were worth so much *butter*, but as that would stick he had brought its value in coin. Hus-

band's whole residence in Carolina, a period covering less than twenty years, seems to have been stormy much of the time. His coming is recorded as follows: "Herman Husband produced a certificate." This is the record of Cane Creek meeting for 1755, 12th month. Stephen B. Weeks says that Husband first came to Carolina in 1751 to Carver's Creek in Bladen County, that he had been prominent among the Friends in East Nottingham, Md., had once had a certificate to visit the Barbadoes and that he and his younger brother Joseph were the first of the family who were Friends.

In 1762 Herman Husband married Mary Pugh, and a section of the marriage certificate runs thus: "Now these are to certify whom it may concern that the full accomplishing of this said marriage this 16th day of 6 mo. 1762, Herman Husband and Mary Pugh appeared in a public meeting of the said people for that purpose at the meeting house of said people in the 'haw fields' (?), etc." (This Hawfields is rather indefinite, but perhaps somewhere on Haw River.) However, the minute in Cane Creek Monthly Meeting for 7th month, 1762, is as follows: "The Friends appointed to attend the marriage of Herman Husband and Mary Pugh report it was orderly accomplished."

In 1764, only two years later, we find the minute which made such a stir in the meeting and which was passed over a protest on the part of certain members, that given above showing his disownment. While other parties in the Rachel Wright faction seem to have been restored to active membership, we have no record that Herman Husband ever became reinstated.

Whether the Rachel Wright was a kinswoman of Husband's or whether the two families had intermarried is easily suggested by the fact that Husband's daughter married a Wright. This daughter remained a resident of North Carolina though and lived on Deep River near her father's estate for fifteen or twenty years after the Revolution.

In 1767, 2nd month, there occurs a statement disowning "Amey Allen now Husband" for disorderly[3] marriage. In as

[3] "Disorderly," that is, not in accordance with the discipline.

much as the Quarterly Meeting (5th month, 1766) had been appealed to by the Monthly Meeting in this matter, it must have been an important breach. This is the Quarterly Meeting minute: "Cane Creek likewise refers to the case of those Friends who attended the disorderly marriage of Amey Allen now Husbands for our advice and judgment therein and after mature consideration in the case it appears to be the sense and judgment of this meeting that those Friends who attended such marriage have broke through the rules of our discipline and decent order, and that suitable satisfaction ought to be given for their proceedings, and it is the advice of this meeting to Friends of Cane Creek Monthly Meeting to use their best endeavors in Christian love to bring them to a sense of their outgoings, and if they can't be reclaimed to show their disunity with them." The Friends must have come "to a sense of their outgoings," as no one seems to have been disowned save Amey herself. That she married a Husband and that it made such a stir both in the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings at once raised the question as to whether she were a second wife of the always troublesome Herman Husband. Effort to substantiate this has failed to secure a response.

The Regulation movement did not definitely begin until 1768, and even its first movement was not before 1765, so we see that though Herman Husband had been a Friend, he had already been four years out of the church before becoming a leader in the opposition to unjust taxation. The opinion that Friends were involved in the Regulation movement is no doubt due to the statement of Governor Tryon, that "the Regulators were a faction of Baptists and Quakers who were trying to overthrow the church of England." This charge is so wide of the mark in its conception of the object of the Regulation war and so easy is it to discredit the Quaker part of it that one is surprised at the Governor's great misconception. This "Great Wolf of North Carolina" was a soldier by taste and training, but with a little wife of great social ambition, he perforce set himself to gather money for the erection of a palace at Newbern, which was the wonder of the age and to make life at the capital take on much

the semblance of court functions. The people were already groaning under a burden of taxation which sapped their private incomes and left them rebellious and discontented, and to add yet more to satisfy luxury was more than they could endure. In many ways they tried to show their discontent and to make a *fair* and peaceable adjustment, but availing little they finally were exasperated and so came the Regulation movement, ending in the Battle of Alamance, May 16, 1771.

That Herman Husband should be a leader in a movement for justice and fair play is but natural. As a citizen he was reputed to be "sober, intelligent, industrious and prosperous; honest and just in his dealings, the owner of a considerable body of good land and judging from his crops a good farmer. His 'clover meadows and fields of wheat' that Tryon destroyed are described as particularly fine." There is no evidence that he was either violent or depraved or seditious, but only lawfully and naturally restive under official oppression. That Husband was the target for the Regulation opposition no less than in the church quarrel of years before proves him a good agitator and one who believes in putting principles in action, and doing so fearless of consequences. That he suffered much on account of his interest in the Regulation movement is amply proved by a careful perusal of the annals of the same. That he was always discreet would have been practically impossible in one of his temperament, or who felt so keenly as he the injustice of the oppression of the time and the continuous threats on the part of the government. Defeated as he was in that to which he had given so loyally the most vigorous years of his life, after the Battle of Alamance, Husband leaves the State, goes to Pennsylvania, where he becomes a partner in the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794, here again proving true to the spirit which he had manifested in Carolina.

Not having been born a Quaker (Husband himself says he was born in the Church of England), and having had only a few years of Quaker training and discipline, one does not wonder that when expelled from the church Husband should easily have fallen into non-Quakerly ways.

That Friends in Alamance, and Cane Creek Meeting in particular, were much troubled during the Regulation days is proved both negatively and positively. The minutes of that meeting around 1771 are very meager, as if the meeting were at a low ebb, and for positive proof we have so early as 1768 this entry: "Abraham Hammer and George Henry are complained of for joining a number to withstand paying taxes until better satisfied to know what such monies are applied to *also* for *making warlike preparations.*" They were disowned.

Again in 1769: "Herman Cox is complained of for joining the Regulators so called. Labor being extended from month to month without any hopes of reclaiming, etc.," he was disowned.

Again in 1776, which it will be noted is five years after the Battle of Alamance, one John Hinshaw presented to the meeting a statement "condemning going in company with the Regulators." This seems to have satisfied the meeting and he retained his membership.

That New Garden Monthly Meeting was equally zealous to maintain the Quaker testimony against all war is shown by the expulsion of Jesse Lane and Edward Thornbrough for joining in the Regulation movement. That these Friends were disowned without let or hindrance is ample proof that Friends as a body had no part in the warlike procedure, however much they may have been a part of those North Carolinians whom Washington Irving in his life of George Washington (V. 4, Chapter VIII) describes as possessing "a quick sensibility to wrong, a stern appreciation of their rights and an indomitable spirit of freedom and independence. It was in fact the spirit of popular liberty and self-government which stirred within them and gave birth to the glorious axiom, 'The rights of the many against the exactions of the few.'" It was this spirit which led Herman Husband to be a leader in the uprising on account of *economic* wrongs, which touched his sympathy for an aggrieved people and made him plead for justice which the world has interpreted as leadership in rebellion. That this war of the Regulation was an economic uprising would make it very reasonable that Friends might have been strong promoters of the movement until it

should become military. For none more than the Friends have at all times and under all circumstances opposed injustice and oppression whether it be toward the men in red skins or those in black or toward themselves.

Herman Husband must have been a man of force and a man who could not be mediocre; and it is for this reason that wherever he goes his presence is felt, and felt on the side on which in his judgment justice is to be found. For this we can but admire the man, though his methods could not and did not gain the sanction of the church. And while he was true to his convictions, the church, too, was careful in a praiseworthy manner to maintain its standards for peace as well as exercise due Christian care before disowning its members.

Again I repeat that in all the annals of Quakerism in North Carolina there is no church quarrel on record more far-reaching in results than that of Rachel Wright; for it gave Herman Husband significance in the church, which fact might have been overlooked in his later prominence in State history. It also was the primary cause which led to the large settlement of Friends in Georgia. Not that all the membership of the Wrightsboro (Ga.) meeting were discontents from Cane Creek by any means; but that the *leaders* were is established without doubt, namely, James Maddock and Jonathan Sell [Cell], the friends and upholders of Herman Husband.

And, last but not least, in an ulterior manner, saved the Society of Friends in North Carolina from furnishing the leader in the Regulation movement.

Guilford College, N. C.

DECLARATION OF FIDELITY TO WILLIAM III[1]

[The following interesting document, as well as that which follows it, has been sent to THE BULLETIN by M. Ethel Crawshaw, of the Friends' Reference Library, London.

[1]Record Office C. O. 5. 1257 p. 537.

As Andrew Hamilton, referred to in the document as "our Governor Andrew Hamilton," was Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania, 1701-1703, the date of the declaration cannot be earlier than 1701. The "Horrid Plott" probably was that known as the Assassination or Fenwick's Plot, from Sir John Fenwick, one of the chief conspirators. It occurred in 1696, and Fenwick was captured, condemned by a Bill of Attainder, and was executed early in 1697.

As a result of Fenwick's and other plots against William, an association, known as the Loyal Association, was formed to protect him or to avenge his death should he be assassinated. All officers, civil and military, were required to join it. It was also joined by over four hundred members of the House of Commons and by thousands of private persons.—Editor.]

Wee the subscribers to this present Instrument (being vnder y^e^ Denomination of Quakers) haueing Vnderstood, that a Horrid Plott, and Conspiracy, hath bin Contrived against y^e^ person and Government, of King William y^e^ third over England &c: which it hath please I God Graciousely to prevent; by a timely Discovery thereof: as appears at large, by an Act of Parliament presented to vs at this time by our Governor, Andrew Hamilton: Recommending it as propper, for us after y^e^ Example of England &c: to subscribe; to y^e^ form of an association in that Act Contained. Or at least; that such of us whose Religiouse Principles will not Suffer us to Subscribe in manner and form therein Expressed: Should Answer y^e^ Jntent of it, by Subscribeing to a Declaration, of our ffidelity and Loyalty, to y^e^ King and Government as now Established; which we willingly, and Chearfully, doe in manner ffollowing viz:

Wee doe Sollemnly Promise, and Declare; in y^e^ presence of God; y^e^ Wittness of y^e^ truth of what we say.

That we will allwayes be ffaithfull to King William; and vse all such Endeavors, as we can: for y^e^ preservation and Safety of his person and Government. And doe Utterly Abhorr, and Detest, all Traiterouse and Dissloyall practices, against our King and Government, and are Thankfull to God, for his preservations Continued Over his person; and y^e^ Realmes he Rules which we pray God long to Continue in peace and Safety.

Sam[ll] Jenings Speak[r]
ffrancis Dauenport
William Biddle
Mahlon Stacye
Daniel Wills
Tho: Gardiner
Thomas Thackera
Richard Heritage
John Taylor
James Atkinson
Sam[ll] Spicer
John Adames
Thomas Raper
Joshua Humphris
Thomas Lambert
John Scott
Henry ballinger
Richard Darkin
hananiah ganns
Joseph Cooper
Joseph Browne
John Wright
John Hugg
Mathew Medcalfe
The ✝ Mark of
John ✝ Woolston
The D Marke of
John Day
Sam[ll] Wade
John Hugg Ju[r]
Wm. Hall

William Cooper
John Hollinshead
Peter Strettwell
Joh[n] Beere
Benj. Wheate
John Thompson
William Pate
Archebell Mickell
ffreedom Lippincott
Robert Widder
William Wood
George Deacon

CERTIFICATE FOR JOHN GRUBB, 1731.

[The original of the following certificate is now (1914) in the possession of J. Ernest Grubb, of Carrick on Suir, Ireland. He writes concerning it that it was issued when John Grubb

was coming home after building a ship for Francis Am[illegible] Waterford. The first name in the original is not very c[illegible] might be Bunby, Buzby, or Bunley. The careful statem[illegible] the document are very characteristic. Many of the names a[illegible] pended to the paper will be familiar to not a few readers of the BULLETIN.—EDITOR.].

CERTIFICATE FOR JOHN GRUBB, 1731.

ffrom our Mens Monthly meeting of friends at Burlington in the Province of New Jersey held the 6th day of the 7th mo: 1731. To the mens monthly Meeting at Killcomon in the County of Tipparary in Jreland.

These may Certifie that our friend John Grubb by his letter to us desired that a Confirmation from our Monthly Meeting might be had to what some of our friends gave him at his going of from us and accordingly application was made to our Mens Meeting and after due Enquirey was made it appeared that he had frequented our Meetings as often as his Occasions would allow and that when he was at liberty, and was pretty Orderly in his Conversation and very Carefull and dilligent about his Imployers affairs. so desireng his wellfare in the truth that is unchangeable we remain your friends and brethren.

Signed by order and on the behalf of the said Meeting by us

THOMAS BUNBY
JONATHAN WRIGHT
RICHARD SMITH
THOMAS SCATTERGOOD
JOHN CRAIG
DANIEL SMITH
CALEB RAPER
JOSHUA RAPER
MATTHEW CHAMPION
EBENEZER LARGE
JOHN WILLS
HENRY BURR
HUGH SHARP
JOHN RODMAN junior
IS DE COW
DANIELL WILLS
THOMAS WETHERLL
JOHN GREEN
JOHN STOKES

ANNUAL MEETING OF FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PHILADELPHIA, 1914.

Arrangements were made to hold the Tenth Annual Meeting of Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia on Third month 2d, 1914, but owing to the severe snow-storm of the previous night and the resultant blockade of many lines of travel, the meeting was postponed until Third month 12th, 1914.

The business meeting convened in the west room of the Meeting House at Fourth and Arch Streets, Philadelphia, at 6 p. m., with about seventy-five members present.

The usual routine of reports and the nomination and election of officers and councillors first claimed attention.

Amelia M. Gummere, on behalf of the committee having in consideration the preparation and publication of a complete edition of the Journal of John Woolman from the original manuscripts, made a brief verbal report. The editorial work is now in progress and it is hoped that it may be possible to have the work published in about a year's time.

Allen C. Thomas, editor of the BULLETIN, made an earnest plea soliciting those who have old papers, letters, bills, etc., etc., that might be of historic interest, to send such to him for examination or review. From such material oftentimes valuable items may be gathered and preserved by being published in the BULLETIN. Papers sent for this purpose will be returned to the senders, if so requested, if they are not yet prepared to present them to the Society.

Tong Sing Kow,[1] who holds an important position as a mining engineer under the Chinese Government, and who graduated from the University of California about twenty-five years ago, was present as a guest. Upon invitation of the President he favored the meeting with a few remarks, which were expressive of his gratification of meeting with Friends in the old historic meeting-house and of his appreciation and interest in Quaker history.

---

[1] Tong Sing Kow is the original of the story of "The Chinese Quaker," written by Nellie Blessing-Eyster, New York, 1902.

The meeting was then adjourned.

A few minutes later the supper room became an attractive scene, where members and their guests were comfortably seated at tables which were arranged tastefully with an ample repast.

Carnations, daffodils and other flowers were used in decoration, and at each plate was placed an appropriate souvenir folder, representing a view of the Arch Street Meeting House, and the pictures entitled, "George Fox Refusing to Take the Oath" and "John Woolman and the Slave."

After the supper Amelia M. Gummere read a valuable paper describing "John Woolman at Home."

She emphasized especially the human side of his life, which was largely omitted in the published editions of his Journal, which represent more of his spiritual experiences. He represents the beginning of the type of the modern Friend in his work for the social betterment of mankind, but he worked as an individual and not in the organized corporate group. Having no taste for agriculture, he learned the trade of tailor, and later in his life he was a teacher of Friends' children. He traveled in the ministry from New England to North Carolina, and his death occurred while upon a religious visit in England.

Gertrude Roberts Sherer followed with a refreshing, interesting review and characterization of the early Friends, entitled "When Quakerism was Young."

George Fox and his co-workers having experienced the enlightment of the Divine Light in their souls, and being convinced of the Truth, felt confident of their message and hesitated not to proclaim it to the world. They believed that practical religious and social reforms would lead to the transformation of the world. George Fox gathered about him leaders, many of them youthful men, such as John Audland, Edward Burroughs, Francis Howgil, John Camm, Gervase Benson, Richard Hubberthorn and others, who accepted the call to service, and by their lives and teaching made it their business to proclaim the Truth to all conditions of people. They took time for fellowship and leadership and ministers were sent out to the little meetings that "they should not be left only to wait." M. S. A.

OFFICERS OF THE FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PHILADELPHIA FOR 1914.

President, RAYNER W. KELSEY

Vice-Presidents, ISAAC SHARPLESS
AMELIA M. GUMMERE

Secretary-Treasurer, MARY S. ALLEN

Councillors Serving 1913-1914

FRANCIS R. TAYLOR
D. ROBERT YARNALL
HENRY TATNALL BROWN
CAROLINE W. SMEDLEY
WATSON W. DEWEES
ARTHUR H. THOMAS

Councillors Serving 1914-1915

JOHN T. MORRIS
J. WHITALL NICHOLSON
STANLEY RHOADS YARNALL
HANNAH P. MORRIS
LUCY C. SHELMIRE
ALICE H. YARNALL

BOOKS, ETC., RECENTLY ISSUED, AND OF INTEREST TO FRIENDS.

John Woolman, His Life and Our Times; Being a Study in Applied Christianity. By W. Teignmouth Shore. Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1913. 12mo, ix, 273 pp. 5 shillings net.

From England, where John Woolman laid down his saintly life, comes an appreciation of the man and his work which is still another effort to visualize this remarkable character. He shares with Shakespeare an almost total lack of facts dealing with his personal life, for his Journal has the first requisite of a classic, in that it might have been written for any, or for all, time.

To make up for this absence of the human, or rather, the personal, note, W. T. Shore has supplied some interesting pages on the Quaker Philadelphia of John Woolman's day.

The "Story of an Old Farm," by Andrew Mellick, which he quotes for the country setting of Northampton Township, belongs rather to the hills of Northern New Jersey than to the perfectly flat, and ultra-English surroundings in which Woolman was born. No more conservative, plain Quaker social atmosphere ever existed than the Jersey village of Rancocas in the eighteenth century. The atmosphere depicted by Andrew Mellick is essentially Dutch, while Burlington County, even in the survival of certain customs, to-day bears evidence of its pure English ancestry. The house in Mt. Holly, incorrectly illustrated by Bowden (History of Friends in America, Vol. 2, p. 393) as Woolman's, was, in fact, built in 1786, by another tailor, also a Quaker, Jabez Woolston, as the date-stone still testifies. It would be ungracious to dwell on slight slips, such as the "appointment" of Woolman as "Minister at Mount Holly particular meeting" (p. 45); the location of the Philadelphia merchant, John Smith, in Burlington, in 1748 (p. 58), and various other errors.

What we seek is Woolman's "Christianity" applied to "Our Times"—and we are disappointed when we miss this altogether. Nevertheless, let us rejoice at having a sympathetic pen dwell so lovingly on the wonderful Journal and selections from Woolman's essays. It is much to have attention again called to their timeliness, and the loveliness of a saintlike character loses nothing in the hands of W. Teignmouth Shore.

AMELIA M. GUMMERE.

Annual Monitor for 1914. No. 102. John Bellows, Gloucester, 1913. 16mo. viii, 191 pp. One shilling and six pence.

This issue of this familiar series is an unusually interesting one, containing as it does memoirs of several Friends well known to American Friends. Such are Sarah Satterthwaite Clark, Joseph Storrs Fry, Thomas

Hodgkin, all of whom were over eighty years of age, Henry Stanley Newman, and James Tangye.

Clio, a Muse, and Other Essays, Literary and Pedestrian. By George Macaulay Trevelyan, author of "Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic," etc. With map. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1913. 8vo. viii, 200 pp. $1.50 net.

Of this attractive and valuable collection of essays, the only one which especially interests readers of the BULLETIN is a short one on John Woolman. The author's presentation is pleasant, appreciative and sympathetic, but adds nothing that is new.

Separations in America. By Edward Grubb, 1914. Hadley Brothers. One shilling.

This little book is a reprint of the papers which appeared in the *British Friend* during 1913. They form a survey from an English pen of the regrettable divisions which occurred among American Friends during the nineteenth century. There will doubtless be some difference of opinion regarding the author's inferences and conclusions, but his aim is very clearly to be impartial and give an accurate account. The view of an honest outsider is always suggestive.

A History of Pennsylvania. By Allen C. Thomas, A.M. . . . D. C. Heath & Co. Boston, New York, Chicago [1913]. 12mo. vi, 312 pp. 75 cents.

This short history of Pennsylvania has been written chiefly for use in the public schools of Pennsylvania. The author, who is the editor of the BULLETIN, has endeavored "to furnish a brief, yet adequate, account of the history of Pennsylvania in a form which will commend itself to teachers and pupils."

Though in no sense a Quaker book, it presents the history of colonial Pennsylvania, not only from a sympathetic point of view, but with an understanding of Quaker history, tenets, customs, and aims which one can scarcely attain who has not been "to the manner born."

Christ and War, the Reasonableness of Disarmament on Christian, Humanitarian and Economic Grounds. A Peace Study Text-Book. By William E. Wilson, B.D. Lecture at Woodbrooke, Warden and Tutor of Kingsmead Hostel. With a Prefatory Letter by Dr. Rendel Harris, London: James Clarke & Co., 1913. 12mo. viii, 211 pp. One shilling.

This little book is an excellent presentation of the peace problem from the Christian point of view. The author, while fully recognizing the value of the economic arguments so ably set forth by Norman Angell, emphasizes the position that war is wrong.

The author says: "Though this book has been written by a member of the Society of Friends, at the request of members of that Society, and in part is an attempt to set forth their views in the matter, the author has endeavored to use only such argument as will appeal to all who sincerely wish to be guided by the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ."

Written for the use of Study Circles in as brief a manner as is possible with clear statement, the book lacks something in point of style, but we know of no book which gives so valuable a statement of the whole question in so short a compass.

At the end of each chapter suggestions for further reading are given, and a good bibliography and index conclude the work. It is a pleasure to commend the work to our readers.

A Quaker Warrior: The Life of William Hobson. By Wm. King Baker, London: Headley Brothers. [1913]. 12 mo., pp. 178. Price, 3 shillings 6 pence. For sale by Friends' Book and Tract Committee, 144 East 20th St., New York City. $1.00 post paid.

This little volume is partly an autobiography. It is a brief account of the active revival work of a Friend widely known in England and to many American Friends. William Hobson was one of the earliest workers—the second, we believe—under the Home Mission Committee of London Yearly Meeting. He began his work at St. Ives, Huntingdonshire, in November, 1883. It was natural that many Friends should feel uneasiness at the methods used to forward the work, as they were new to the body of the Society. The zeal, earnestness and devotion of William Hobson are clearly brought out in the book. It was largely due to him that the Friends' Meeting at Cambridge, long closed, was reopened. There are two portraits and three interesting illustrations.

Ten Years Near the Arctic Circle. By J. J. Armistead. Author of "A Short History of Fish Culture," "An Angler's Paradise and How to Obtain It," "Piloted," etc., etc. London: Headley Brothers Bishopsgate, 1913. 12mo. pp. 252. 3 shillings 6 pence. For sale by New York Book and Tract Committee, 144 East 20th St., New York City. $1.20 post paid.

This volume is a continuation of "Piloted," an earlier work by the same author. The author, an experienced yachtsman, became interested in the fishermen and inhabitants of the numerous islands off the west coast of Norway, north and south of the Arctic Circle. After visiting this region he bought a sloop thirty-five feet long and well adapted and fitted up for sea trips and named her "The Red Cross." In her, summer after summer, accompanied most of the time by his wife, daughter, and son and his wife, he cruised up and down these waters, visiting the

villages and settlements in that northern region extending spiritual and medical aid and furnishing food and supplies to the needy. He finally spent the winters there also. The expenses of this great undertaking have been borne by the missionary himself, supplemented by such aid as is sent by others interested in the work. He and his family "receive nothing in the way of salary." It is an exceedingly interesting account of mission work practically unknown to Americans. There are twelve admirable illustrations. It is to be regretted that a brief introduction should not have been supplied giving readers of this volume some idea of the starting of the work and of the history of the earlier days. To one who has not the opportunity of consulting "Piloted" it is like beginning with volume two of a continuous work.

The Quaker Bonnet—A Child-Story. By KKK., author of "The Living Remnant and other Quaker stories. London. Headley Brothers, Bishopsgate, E.C. 12mo. pp. 265. Price, 3 shillings 6 pence. For sale by New York Book and Tract Committee, 144 East 20th St., New York City. $1.25 post paid.

This book, by an author who writes under the pseudonym KKK., is one which will appeal to "grown-ups" rather than children. It is intended to represent life among the English Friends of about thirty years ago. The style sometimes gives the impression of "writing down" so as to be clear to children. The child heroine is the most successful picture, but that of the old dealer in dolls does not give the impression of reality, though it may be based upon a real character. The story is interesting. As a whole the book is not as successful as the collection of short stories by the same author, entitled "The Living Remnant and Other Quaker Stories."

NOTES AND QUERIES

HOLDER'S QUAKERS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA.—We are informed that a second edition is in the press, in which the typographical errors noted in the last number of the BULLETIN, and in *The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, will be corrected. We fear, however, unless large portions of the work have been re-written and other parts omitted, the book cannot be regarded as essentially improved, or as a *history* of Friends.

JOURNAL OF JOHN WOOLMAN.—Those who had the privilege of hearing Amelia M. Gummere's paper on John Woolman at the Annual Meeting of the Society noticed elsewhere in this number, will look with great expectations to the new edition of the Journal which she is editing from the original manuscripts. Every one who can, should subscribe to the volume, which is put at the low price of $1.75. The editing, involving much work and great care, is a labor of love.

Subscriptions may be sent to Mary S. Allen, secretary, 24 West Street, Media, Pa.

DISCONTINUANCE OF THE BRITISH FRIEND.—With the number for Twelfth Month, 1913, the *British Friend* closed its long career. It was founded in 1843 by William and Robert Smeal, of Glasgow, and for the whole period of its long life the paper has occupied an independent position. Its editors have been men of decided views and sometimes of views not in accord with the great body of Friends, but great sincerity of purpose has always been a characteristic of the paper.

More liberal, in the past certainly, than its contemporary, *The Friend* (London), in admitting papers on various subjects, some scarcely connected with Friends, its contributors have often used even greater frankness of statement than Americans are wont to ascribe to our British cousins.

The file of the *British Friend* is one which no student of Quaker history can afford to neglect. Not only do its pages reflect and report the contemporaneous opinions, but the volumes contain many papers and documents relating to Friends which are of the highest value, some of which are scarcely accessible elsewhere. It is greatly to be regretted that so few complete sets are available for American students.

BRITISH FRIEND.—William and Robert Smeal, of Glasgow, in their prospectus, say that owing to the discontinuance of the *Irish Friend* at the close of 1842, there

seemed to be a need for a similar paper. Accordingly the *British Friend* was started First month 31, 1843. It is stated that the new paper would advocate the abolition of slavery and the slave trade; the protection of aborigines; improvement of the condition of their fellow subjects—natives of India; moral reform; peace societies, and the cause of temperance. Literary and scientific contributions, it is stated, would be welcome. The immediate repeal of the Corn Laws was also advocated. That this course was steadily pursued is shown by the files of the paper.

The paper, at first a quarto (1843-1845), was in 1845 changed to octavo, which size was retained until the close (1846-1913).

The editors were William and Robert Smeal 1843-1860, when William Smeal died, and his brother Robert continued as editor until his death in 1886. J. G. Smeal, a son, held the place until 1892, when the paper was sold to a group of Friends by whom the editorship was intrusted to William Edward Turner, of Birkenhead, to which place the paper was moved. In 1897 W. E. Turner removed to Colwyn Bay, North Wales, taking the paper with him. In 1901, on account of W. E. Turner's failing eyesight, Edward Grubb became assistant editor, and in Eighth month of the same year editor-in-chief, when the paper was moved to London, and in 1906 to Croydon, where it remained until its discontinuance.

Irish Friend.—This periodical is little known among American Friends. In character and form it closely resembled the *British Friend*, which was its successor. It was established by William Bell, of Belfast in 1838, who was, so far as we know, its only editor and publisher. Its home was Belfast, Ireland. William Bell removed to America in 1842 or 1843, and the paper was discontinued at the close of the year 1842. Like the *British Friend*, much of interest to students of Quaker history will be found in its volumes (1838-1842).

Present-Day Papers.—"*Le roi est mort, vive le roi!*". With the discontinuance of the *British Friend*, noticed above, there appeared, First month 1, 1914, a new periodical with the title "*Present-Day Papers, a Monthly Journal for the Presentation of Vital and Spiritual Christianity*. Rufus M. Jones, M.A., Litt.D., editor-in-chief; Henry J. Cadbury, M.A., business manager, Haverford, Pa." Though this new monthly does not outwardly present the appearance of a Friends' periodical, it is certainly *Friendly* in its editor, manager, and its editorial board, of which a majority are Friends. The point of view of the contributions, so far, is also *Friendly*, or at least sympathetic.

The new journal is not intended "to be a controversial periodical,"

but "to be [a] restrained, steady, constructive and edifying" one. Its field is to be wider than the Society of Friends, and consequently what is known as "Society news" will find no place on its pages. It therefore does not come into competition with any strictly Friends' periodical.

The journal is intended to meet a felt need, and, while it has hardly yet in the four numbers which have appeared (January-April, 1914) fully found itself, the outlook is full of promise. (Subscription is placed at $1.50, or 6s. 6d., postpaid, per annum. Address, Present-Day Papers, Haverford, Pennsylvania.)

TIME OF HOLDING PHILADELPHIA YEARLY MEETING.—After remaining unaltered for 117 years, the time of holding Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was changed, by the Yearly Meeting of 1914, from the third Second day in the Fourth month to the last Second day in the Third month.

The old Ms. Discipline of 1762 gives the following information regarding changes: "It appears by the records that the first Yearly Meeting was held at Burlington in the house of Thomas Gardiner the first day of the 6th month [8th mo. New Style] 1681." In 1685, "It was unanimously agreed and concluded by the Meeting that there be but one Yearly Meeting in Pennsylvania and West Jersey, one year at Burlington and another at Philadelphia and to be held the next year at Burlington on the first First day of the 7th month [9th month New Style] for Worship and the Fourth day to be for the Men's and Women's Meetings. The next year after to be at Philadelphia, on the same day of the same month, and to continue the same time. This agreement to continue until further orders."

The next Minute regarding the Yearly Meeting is in 1712, and is as follows: "As to the proposal for an alteration of the Yearly Meeting of Business to Philadelphia, to be there held every year, This Meeting concludes it's best for divers Considerations to remain as it is at present established. But this Meeting being of Opinion, that a Yearly Meeting for Worship, to be held at Philadelphia annually, may be of Service, Therefore appoints that a Meeting shall be held at Philadelphia on the second First day of the week in the next third month [5th month New Style] and hold two days for Worship, and so to be continued annually on the same day." In 1713, "The time fixed upon for the Spring Yearly Meeting at Philadelphia, was altered to the third first day of the week in the third Month [5th month New Style].

"1755. Agreed to continue to hold our Yearly Meeting on the third first day of the Week, in the ninth Month [New Style], and that the General Meeting in the Spring be held on the fourth first day of the Week in the third month and that the Yearly Meet-

ing at Salem hereafter be held on the third first day of the week, in the fifth month."

"1758. Agreed to hold the Yearly Meeting on the fourth first day of the week in the ninth Month."

"1760. The consideration of the properest place for holding our Yearly Meetings for Business in future, now coming under the solid Notice and thought of this Meeting, and much time being spent thereon, and full opportunity being given for a free Communication of Friends' sentiments, and the calming Influences of Gospel Love being over us, It appears to be the most general Sense, that Philadelphia as it is the nearest Central for the Body of the Society, it is therefore the most convenient for that Purpose."

In 1798 the time of holding the Yearly Meeting was changed to the third Second day in the Fourth month, which remained the date until the change made in 1914, to take effect in 1915.

JOURNAL OF THE FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY.—The number of our esteemed contemporary for Fourth month, 1914, comes to hand just as the BULLETIN is going to the press. Among the most interesting papers are those on "Benjamin Furly," and "Benjamin Furly and His Library." So little is available concerning this friend of George Fox, William Penn and John Stubbs, that these papers are valuable. Benjamin Furly was also the friend and correspondent of the philosopher John Locke, of Algernon Sidney, Lord Shaftesbury and others. He collected a very large library, for a private one. The greater part of his collection was religious and theological. Curiously enough a list of his books and the prices they brought at auction after his death has been preserved, and is now in the British Museum. The sale was "from the 22d to the 27th of October, 1714;" and the number of lots was 4,430, and the total amount realized was £7,-638. 19. 0. One of the lots was Jacob Behmen's Works, in twelve volumes, which brought £15. 15. 0.